

FILED

SEP 20 2005

1 BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP
2 DAVID M. BALABANIAN (SBN 37368)
3 CHRISTOPHER B. HOCKETT (SBN 121539)
4 JOY K. FUYUNO (SBN 193890)
5 Three Embarcadero Center
6 San Francisco, California 94111-4067
7 Telephone: (415) 393-2000

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

5 Attorneys for Defendant
6 Intel Corporation

7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 IAN WALKER, individually and on behalf of all
12 others similarly situated,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware
16 Corporation,

17 Defendant.

No. C-05-2882-MHP

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER TO EXTEND TIME FOR
DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO
COMPLAINT

17 IT IS STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THROUGH THEIR
18 COUNSEL AS FOLLOWS:

19 Pursuant to Civil L.R. 6-2, Plaintiff Ian Walker and Defendant Intel Corporation
20 ("Intel") hereby stipulate that Intel's response to Plaintiff's complaint shall be due the earlier of
21 (1) 60 days after transfer of the above-captioned case pursuant to any motion to coordinate or
22 consolidate pre-trial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 or such time for response that the
23 transferee Court may require for any action made part of the same MDL, or (2) 45 days after any
24 such motion has been denied. The parties request this extension of time to answer or otherwise
25 respond because Plaintiffs in *Brauch, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, No. C-05-2743 (N.D. Cal., filed July
26

Case No. C-05-2882-MHP

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND TIME FOR DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO
COMPLAINT

1 5, 2005), a related matter, have filed a petition to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings
2 per 28 U.S.C. Section 1407, and the above-captioned action has been identified as a related
3 action to that petition. As a result, the outcome of the pending petition will impact significantly
4 the schedule of this case.

5 This is the first stipulation between the parties. Because this litigation has just
6 begun, granting such a stipulation will not have any negative impact on the schedule of this case.

7 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.
DATED: September 14, 2005

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP

11 By: /s/ Joy K Fuyuno
12 Joy K. Fuyuno
Attorneys for Defendant
Intel Corporation

DATED: September 15, 2005

FINKELSTEIN, THOMPSON & LOUGHREAN

By: Ali Oromchian / V.M.F.
Ali Oromchian
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Ian Walker

[PROPOSED] ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Intel Corporation's response to Plaintiff's complaint shall be due the earlier of (1) 60 days after transfer of the above-captioned case pursuant to any motion to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1407 or such time for response that the transferee Court may require for any action made part of the same MDL, or (2) 45 days after any such motion has been denied.

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 16, 2005

~~Honorable Marilyn H. Patel~~
United States District Judge